

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10  
1112 CHARLES L. WILLIAMS, ) No. C 04-2086 MMC (PR)  
13 Plaintiff, )  
14 v. ) **ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS'**  
15 MARTHA CAMPOS, M.D., ) **MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY**  
16 HORACIO CAMPOS, M.D., J. ) **JUDGMENT; DIRECTING PLAINTIFF**  
17 PENDLETON, M.D., ) **TO EFFECTUATE SERVICE UPON OR**  
18 M. INOCENCIO, R.N., ) **PROVIDE COURT WITH LOCATION**  
19 Defendants. ) **INFORMATION FOR UNSERVED**  
20 ) **DEFENDANT**  
21 )  
22 ) **(Docket No. 36)**  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )28 On May 26, 2004, plaintiff Charles Williams, a California prisoner currently  
incarcerated in San Quentin State Prison ("SQSP"), filed the above-titled civil rights action  
pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging the violation of his constitutional rights while he was  
housed at the Santa Rita County Jail ("Santa Rita"). Plaintiff twice amended his complaint.  
On October 19, 2004, after reviewing the Second Amended Complaint<sup>1</sup>, the Court found  
plaintiff had stated cognizable claims against defendants M. Inocencio, R.N. ("Inocencio"),  
Horacio Campos, M.D. ("Dr. Horacio Campos"), Martha Campos, M.D. ("Dr. Martha  
Campos") and J. Pendleton, M.D. ("Dr. Pendleton"), all Santa Rita employees.28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1844  
1845  
1846  
1847  
1848  
1849  
1849  
1850  
1851  
1852  
1853  
1854  
1855  
1856  
1857  
1858  
1859  
1859

1 Inocencio, Dr. Horacio Campos, and Dr. Martha Campos (hereinafter “defendants”)  
2 have filed a joint motion for summary judgment.<sup>2</sup> Plaintiff has opposed this motion, and  
3 defendants have filed a reply.

4 **BACKGROUND<sup>3</sup>**

5 In March 2000, during a previous incarceration at Santa Rita, plaintiff was diagnosed,  
6 by Dr. Brett Curtis (“Dr. Curtis”),<sup>4</sup> with an inguinal hernia. (Defs.’ Ex. B.) Plaintiff was  
7 released from Santa Rita on April 27, 2000; he was returned to Santa Rita on August 22,  
8 2002. (Defs.’ Exs. C, D.) The following day, August 23, 2002, he was examined by  
9 Inocencio, who confirmed plaintiff had a hernia and noted he was in no acute distress. (Defs.’  
10 Ex. E.) Inocencio conferred with Dr. Curtis who ordered a “suspensory jockstrap” to relieve  
11 plaintiff’s discomfort. (Defs.’ Exs. E, F.) On June 11, 2003, plaintiff, complaining of pain,  
12 returned to the infirmary, at which time he was again examined by Inocencio, as well as by  
13 Dr. Pendleton. (Defs.’ Exs. E, G.) Plaintiff requested, and Dr. Pendleton ordered, a new  
14 suspensory jockstrap; Dr. Pendleton denied plaintiff’s request for surgery, noting plaintiff  
15 was in no acute distress<sup>5</sup> and that his hernia exhibited “minimal tenderness.” (Defs.’ Ex. G.)

16 On December 16, 2003, plaintiff again returned to the infirmary, complaining of  
17 worsening pain from his hernia. (Defs.’ Ex. G.) He was seen by Inocencio and Dr. Martha  
18 Campos, at which time Inocencio noted plaintiff was not wearing his suspensory jock strap  
19 and Dr. Martha Campos ordered a new one. (Defs.’ Exs. F, G; Declaration of Dr. Horacio  
20 Campos (hereinafter “Campos Decl.”) ¶ 12.) She also prescribed Colace for constipation, to  
21 alleviate any discomfort from straining; she denied plaintiff’s request for surgery. (*Id.*)

22

---

23

24 <sup>2</sup>To date, Dr. Pendleton has not been served. The United States Marshal (“Marshal”)  
25 attempted service on Dr. Pendleton at Santa Rita, where plaintiff indicated Dr. Pendleton had  
treated him, but returned the summons unexecuted because Dr. Pendleton was not employed  
or otherwise located there.

26 <sup>3</sup>The following facts are undisputed and are derived from the parties’ exhibits.

27 <sup>4</sup>Dr. Curtis is not named as a defendant to the instant action.

28 <sup>5</sup>Both Inocencio and Dr. Pendleton used the standard abbreviation “NAD.”

1 On January 9, 2004,<sup>6</sup> plaintiff returned to the infirmary, again asking for surgery and  
2 complaining of “unbearable” pain. (Pl.’s Ex. F.) Dr. Martha Campos examined plaintiff but  
3 found no signs or symptoms warranting immediate surgery. (Defs.’ Ex. J.) She prescribed  
4 pain medication (400 mg. of Motrin), and referred him to the surgery clinic for evaluation of  
5 the hernia. (Defs.’ Exs. J, N.) On February 3, 2004, Dr. Horacio Campos examined plaintiff  
6 in the surgery clinic. (Campos Decl. ¶ 12.) He found no need for immediate surgery,  
7 prescribed pain medication (Percogesic), and ordered plaintiff to return in two weeks for  
8 another surgical evaluation. (Defs.’ Exs. K, N; Campos Decl. ¶ 12.) Plaintiff was transferred  
9 to SQSP on February 13, 2004, before the two weeks had elapsed.

10 On February 18, 2004, plaintiff was examined by an SQSP doctor who ordered a  
11 surgical consultation “ASAP.” (Pl.’s Ex. H.) On February 26, 2004, plaintiff was examined  
12 by a surgeon, who recommended surgery for the hernia. (*Id.*) The surgery was performed at  
13 a hospital outside SQSP on April 30, 2004. (Pl.’s Ex. G.)

## DISCUSSION

## A. Legal Standard

16 Summary judgment is proper where the pleadings, discovery, and affidavits show  
17 there is “no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to  
18 judgment as a matter of law.” See Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c). Material facts are those that may  
19 affect the outcome of the case. See Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248  
20 (1986). A dispute as to a material fact is genuine if the evidence is such that a reasonable  
21 jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving party. See id.

22 The court will grant summary judgment “against a party who fails to make a showing  
23 sufficient to establish the existence of an element essential to that party’s case, and on which  
24 that party will bear the burden of proof at trial . . . since a complete failure of proof  
25 concerning an essential element of the nonmoving party’s case necessarily renders all other

27       <sup>6</sup>In his complaint, plaintiff alleges he also was seen by Inocencio on January 6, 2004.  
28 The medical records, however, indicate that on that date he was seen by Nurse Carla Peguese  
for a complaint of a cold and headache, and not for any symptoms related to his hernia.  
(Defs.' Exs. I, J.) Plaintiff does not dispute this point in his opposition.

1 facts immaterial.” See Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322-23 (1986); see also  
 2 Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, 477 U.S. at 248 (holding fact is material if it might affect  
 3 outcome of suit under governing law; further holding dispute about material fact is genuine  
 4 “if the evidence is such that a reasonable jury could return a verdict for the nonmoving  
 5 party”). The moving party bears the initial burden of identifying those portions of the record  
 6 that demonstrate the absence of a genuine issue of material fact. The burden then shifts to  
 7 the nonmoving party to “go beyond the pleadings, and by his own affidavits, or by the  
 8 ‘depositions, answers to interrogatories, or admissions on file,’ designate ‘specific facts  
 9 showing that there is a genuine issue for trial.’” See Celotex, 477 U.S. at 324 (citing Fed. R.  
 10 Civ. P. 56(e)).

11 For purposes of summary judgment, the court must view the evidence in the light most  
 12 favorable to the nonmoving party; if the evidence produced by the moving party conflicts  
 13 with evidence produced by the nonmoving party, the court must assume the truth of the  
 14 evidence submitted by the nonmoving party. See Leslie v. Grupo ICA, 198 F.3d 1152, 1158  
 15 (9th Cir. 1999). The court’s function on a summary judgment motion is not to make  
 16 credibility determinations or weigh conflicting evidence with respect to a disputed material  
 17 fact. See T.W. Elec. Serv. v. Pacific Elec. Contractors Ass’n, 809 F.2d 626, 630 (9th Cir.  
 18 1987).

19 B. Legal Claims

20 Plaintiff claims that defendants were deliberately indifferent to his medical needs by  
 21 failing to order surgery for his hernia while he was at Santa Rita. Deliberate indifference to a  
 22 prisoner’s serious medical needs violates the Eighth Amendment’s proscription against cruel  
 23 and unusual punishment. See Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. 97, 104 (1976). A determination  
 24 of “deliberate indifference” involves an examination of two elements: the seriousness of the  
 25 prisoner’s medical need and the nature of the defendant’s response to that need. McGuckin  
 26 v. Smith, 974 F.2d 1050, 1059 (9th Cir. 1992), overruled on other grounds, WMX  
 27 Technologies, Inc. v. Miller, 104 F.3d 1133, 1136 (9th Cir. 1997) (en banc).

28 A “serious” medical need exists if the failure to treat a prisoner’s condition could

1 result in further significant injury or the “unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain.” Id.  
2 (citing Estelle v. Gamble, 429 U.S. at 104). Indications that a prisoner has a “serious” need  
3 for medical treatment include the existence of an injury that a reasonable doctor or patient  
4 would find important and worthy of comment or treatment, the presence of a medical  
5 condition that significantly affects an individual’s daily activities, and the existence of  
6 chronic and substantial pain. Id. at 1059-60 (citing Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332,  
7 1337-41 (9th Cir. 1990)).

8 A prison official is deliberately indifferent if he knows that a prisoner faces a  
9 substantial risk of serious harm and disregards that risk by failing to take reasonable steps to  
10 abate it. Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 837 (1994) (equating standard with that of  
11 criminal recklessness). The prison official must not only “be aware of facts from which the  
12 inference could be drawn that a substantial risk of serious harm exists,” but he “must also  
13 draw the inference.” Id. If a prison official should have been aware of the risk, but was not,  
14 the official has not violated the Eighth Amendment, no matter how severe the risk. Gibson v.  
15 County of Washoe, 290 F.3d 1175, 1188 (9th Cir. 2002). Consequently, in order for  
16 deliberate indifference to be established, there must exist both a purposeful act or failure to  
17 act on the part of the defendant and harm resulting therefrom. See McGuckin, 974 F.2d at  
18 1060.

19 1. Defendants Inocencio, Dr. Horatio Campos, Dr. Martha Campos

20 With respect to Inocencio, plaintiff has failed to raise a genuine issue of material fact  
21 as to whether any failure to provide surgery at Santa Rita was attributable to such defendant.  
22 Liability may be imposed on an individual defendant under § 1983 only if the plaintiff can  
23 show that such defendant proximately caused the alleged deprivation of the federally  
24 protected right. See Leer v. Murphy, 844 F.2d 628, 634 (9th Cir. 1988). In that regard,  
25 defendants herein present the declaration of Dr. Horacio Campos, in which he states, “As a  
26 nurse, Ms. Inocencio did not have the authority to order” a surgical referral or medication for  
27 plaintiff. (Campos Decl. ¶ 13.) Plaintiff provides no evidence contradicting this statement.  
28 Instead, plaintiff cites to plaintiff’s deposition, in which plaintiff testified Inocencio exhibited

1 “scorn” by stating, “You should have taken care of your problem on the street, and you’re not  
 2 going to the hospital.” (Defs.’ Exs. A at 36-37.) Such remark, however, even if made, does  
 3 not demonstrate Inocencio had the ability or authority to refer plaintiff for surgery.

4 Plaintiff next asserts that he told Inocencio he was in “unbearable” and “great” pain,  
 5 and argues this information “should’ve been enough to warrant the appropriate remedy to  
 6 abate plaintiff’s suffering.” (Opp. at 8.) Even if there were evidence that Inocencio was  
 7 aware of such complaint,<sup>7</sup> however, there is no evidence of deliberate indifference, i.e., there  
 8 is no evidence she had any ability to refer plaintiff for surgery. The record demonstrates that  
 9 each of the three times she saw plaintiff, including the occasions upon which he complained  
 10 of pain from his hernia, Inocencio either consulted a medical doctor or there was a doctor  
 11 present. In particular, in August 2002, she consulted Dr. Curtis; in June 2003 and December  
 12 2003, respectively, Drs. Pendleton and Martha Campos were present. There is no evidence  
 13 that Inocencio, as a nurse, had any reason to question, much less any authority to override,  
 14 the treatment ordered by those medical doctors, which treatment did not include surgery. In  
 15 the absence of such evidence, plaintiff has failed to raise a genuine issue of material fact as to  
 16 whether Inocencio had any effect on the timing of plaintiff’s surgery or in any other respect  
 17 was deliberately indifferent to his medical needs.

18 With respect to Dr. Martha Campos and Dr. Hector Campos, plaintiff has failed to  
 19 present evidence of anything more than a difference of opinion between himself and those  
 20 defendants as to whether surgery was medically necessary during the time he was at Santa  
 21 Rita. “A difference of opinion between a prisoner-patient and prison medical authorities  
 22 regarding treatment does not give rise to a § 1983 claim.” See Franklin v. Oregon, 662 F.2d  
 23

---

24 <sup>7</sup>The evidence presented is that on June 11, 2003, plaintiff told Inocencio he had “tight  
 25 pains,” (Defs.’ Ex. E); on December 16, 2003 he told her he felt “burning and pain” (Defs.’  
 26 Ex. G), and on January 9, 2004, he told *Dr. Martha Campos* the pain was “unbearable” (Pl.’s  
 27 Ex. J). There is no evidence plaintiff ever described his pain to *Inocencio* either as  
 28 “unbearable” or “great.” Plaintiff’s allegations to this effect in his complaint and opposition  
 do not constitute evidence because neither the complaint nor the opposition is verified. See  
Schroeder v. McDonald, 55 F.3d 454, 460 & nn.10-11 (9th Cir. 1995) (allowing verified  
 complaint to function as opposing affidavit under Rule 56 if it is based on personal  
 knowledge and sets forth specific facts admissible in evidence); Johnson v. Meltzer, 134 F.3d  
 1393, 1400 (9th Cir. 1998) (same, with respect to allegations in verified motion).

1 1337, 1344 (9th Cir. 1981); see also Toguchi v. Chung, 391 F.3d 1051, 1059-60 (9th Cir.  
 2 2004). Here, plaintiff challenges the following decisions regarding surgery: Dr. Martha  
 3 Campos's December 16, 2003 decision that plaintiff did not need surgery; Dr. Martha  
 4 Campos's January 9, 2004 decision to refer him to the surgical clinic for a consultation  
 5 instead of ordering immediate emergency surgery; and Dr. Horacio Campos's February 3,  
 6 2004 decision that plaintiff did not need surgery immediately.<sup>8</sup> In that regard, defendants  
 7 have submitted the following medical opinion of Dr. Horacio Campos:

8 14. I am further informed and believe that Mr. Williams claims Dr.  
 9 Martha Campos was deliberately indifferent to his medical needs by not  
 10 immediately referring him for surgery on December 16, 2003, and January 6,  
 11 2004.<sup>9</sup> Mr. Williams had no need for immediate surgery on either of those  
 12 occasions. He had a stable inguinal hernia. Unlike some other hernias, this  
 13 variety of hernia generally is at very low risk for strangulation. They may  
 14 cause no symptoms, and remain the same size for long periods, so that they  
 15 may not need surgery. Dr. Martha Campos thus met the standard of care on  
 16 December 16, by ordering a new suspensory jockstrap and Colace to alleviate  
 17 generalized and bowel movement-related discomfort. She also met the  
 18 standard of care on January 9, by determining no need for emergency surgery  
 19 existed, by ordering Motrin for any hernia-related discomfort, and by referring  
 20 Mr. Williams to the surgical clinic for further evaluation.

21 15. Because Mr. Williams had no need for emergency surgery as of  
 22 February 2004, my decision not to arrange for surgery on an emergent basis  
 23 likewise was medically appropriate. San Quentin physicians implicitly  
 24 confirmed this by not performing surgery for nearly 3 months after the last time  
 25 I saw him.

26 (Campos Decl. ¶¶ 14-15.) Plaintiff offers no evidence to dispute the above evidence that his  
 27 hernia, at the time Drs. Horacio and Martha Campos examined him, was "stable," and "at  
 28 very low risk for strangulation," nor does he offer any evidence that the treatment provided  
 by either such doctor failed to meet the applicable standard of care or was not medically  
 appropriate.

In an effort to create a triable issue of fact as to deliberate indifference, plaintiff points

---

24 <sup>8</sup>Plaintiff also contends Dr. Horacio Campos was present when Inocencio examined  
 25 him in August 2002, relying on a stamp of Dr. Horacio Campos's name at the bottom of a  
 26 page of physician's orders that includes the entry for the August 2002 examination. (Defs.'  
 27 Ex. F.) Dr. Horacio Campos states he was not working at Santa Rita at that time. (Campos  
 Decl. at ¶ 2.) This dispute is immaterial, however, because plaintiff does not contend, nor is  
 there any evidence showing, he requested or required surgery on that occasion.

28 <sup>9</sup>The medical records indicate that on January 6, 2004, plaintiff was seen only by  
 Nurse Peguese, and not by Dr. Martha Campos. (Defs.' Ex. J.)

1 to evidence showing that on February 18, 2004, shortly after his arrival at SQSP, he was  
2 referred for a surgery consultation “ASAP”; that he actually received the surgery on April 30,  
3 2004; and that he was in “unbearable” pain while at Santa Rita. The fact that Dr.  
4 Christensen, the SQSP doctor who examined plaintiff on February 18, 2004, recommended a  
5 surgery *consultation* “ASAP” is not evidence that decisions not to order immediate *surgery*,  
6 made, respectively, 15 days earlier, over a month earlier, and almost two months earlier, were  
7 medically unacceptable. To begin with, Dr. Christensen’s recommendation for a surgery  
8 consultation is consistent with Dr. Martha Campos’s earlier referral for a surgery  
9 consultation in January 2004, as well as with Dr. Horacio Campos’s February 3, 2004 order  
10 that plaintiff return to the clinic for another consultation in two weeks. Indeed, an  
11 examination of the form completed by Dr. Christensen reveals that while he wrote “ASAP,”  
12 he did not circle the term “emergent,” provided on the form to designate an emergency.  
13 (Pl.’s Ex. H.) In addition, the SQSP surgeon who recommended surgery twelve days later,  
14 on February 26, 2004, made no notation of an emergency or urgent need for surgery, (*id.*),  
15 and the SQSP doctors in fact did not perform surgery until April 30, 2004, over one month  
16 thereafter. If anything, such evidence supports the decisions by Drs. Horacio and Martha  
17 Campos that plaintiff did not need surgery immediately or on an emergency basis.

18 With respect to the assertedly “unbearable” pain experienced by plaintiff, the only  
19 evidence of any defendant being apprised thereof is plaintiff’s use of that word in his  
20 January 9, 2004 request for medical treatment, which request was given to Dr. Martha  
21 Campos. Dr. Horacio Campos has opined that the pain related to plaintiff’s condition would  
22 not be expected to rise to such level. (Campos Decl. ¶ 16.) Even assuming plaintiff in fact  
23 was in “unbearable” pain, however, there is no evidence the action taken by Dr. Martha  
24 Campos in January 2004, when she received plaintiff’s request, was medically insufficient.  
25 As described above, Dr. Martha Campos prescribed medication for pain and referred plaintiff  
26 for a surgery consultation. Plaintiff was prescribed additional pain medication when  
27 examined by Dr. Horacio Campos several weeks later. In the absence of evidence such  
28 treatment was a medically unacceptable response to the pain plaintiff described, there is no

1 triable issue of fact as to whether defendants were deliberately indifferent to his serious  
2 medical needs.

3 In his complaint, plaintiff makes several additional allegations in an effort to discredit  
4 the decision not to provide surgery at Santa Rita. These allegations do not constitute  
5 evidence because, as explained above, the complaint is not verified. See Schroeder, 55 F.3d  
6 at 460 & nn.10-11. Nevertheless, even if verified, these allegations would not create a triable  
7 issue of fact. Plaintiff alleges that “to this day I feel pain in my [groin] area.” (Compl. at  
8 4:15-16.) Plaintiff presents no evidence, however, that any such pain is attributable to a  
9 delay in his surgery, or to any improper decision or conduct by defendants. Plaintiff further  
10 alleges he was told by the doctor who performed the surgery: ““this surgery should have been  
11 done by now, and your life is at risk without it”; that his “incision would be a lot wider due  
12 to the length of the delay of surgery”; and that the surgery “became more difficult due to the  
13 delay.” (Compl. at 4.) Such hearsay statements attributed to the surgeon would not constitute  
14 admissible evidence even if contained in a verified complaint. By contrast, although not  
15 required to do so, defendants have offered the following admissible evidence with respect to  
16 the allegation that the delay caused a wider incision and more difficult surgery:

17 I am further informed and believe that Mr. Williams is alleging the  
18 surgery he eventually had on April 30, 2004, was more complicated and  
19 resulted in greater scarring because he did not receive surgery when  
20 incarcerated at Santa Rita. This is untrue. The April 30 surgery only would  
21 have been more complicated if his hernia had become strangulated. As  
22 mentioned above, Mr. Williams’ hernia was not one prone to strangulation, and  
23 I am informed and believe San Quentin physicians would not have waited so  
24 long to perform the surgery if Mr. Williams hernia had become strangulated.  
25 The scar necessitated by surgery likewise would not have been any different if  
26 Martha Campos or I had arranged for Mr. Williams to have surgery before he  
27 was transferred to San Quentin. The recovery period likewise would have been  
28 the same.

(Campos Decl. ¶ 17.)

29 In sum, plaintiff has failed to present evidence sufficient to create a genuine issue of  
30 material fact as to whether any of the moving defendants was deliberately indifferent to his  
31 medical needs in connection with the treatment he received at Santa Rita for his hernia.  
32 Accordingly, defendants Inocencio, Dr. Horacio Campos and Dr. Martha Campos are entitled

1 to summary judgment.<sup>10</sup>

2       2.     Defendant Dr. Pendleton

3       As noted above, the Court ordered the Marshal to serve the complaint on Dr.  
4 Pendleton, along with the other three defendants, at Santa Rita, where plaintiff alleged all  
5 said defendants had treated him. As further noted, the Marshal served the other three  
6 defendants at Santa Rita, but returned the summons unexecuted as to Dr. Pendleton, for the  
7 reason that he could not be located there.

8       In cases wherein the plaintiff proceeds in forma pauperis, the “officers of the court  
9 shall issue and serve all process.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d). The court must appoint the Marshal  
10 to effect service, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(2), and the Marshal, upon order of the court, must  
11 serve the summons and the complaint, see Walker v. Sumner, 14 F.3d 1415, 1422 (9th Cir.  
12 1994). Although a plaintiff who is incarcerated and proceeding in forma pauperis may rely  
13 on service by the Marshal, such plaintiff “may not remain silent and do nothing to effectuate  
14 such service.” Rather, “[a]t a minimum, a plaintiff should request service upon the  
15 appropriate defendant and attempt to remedy any apparent defects of which [he] has  
16 knowledge.” Rochon v. Dawson, 828 F.2d 1107, 1110 (5th Cir. 1987).

17       Here, plaintiff’s complaint has been pending for over 120 days, and thus is subject to  
18 dismissal without prejudice against the unserved defendant, absent a showing of “good  
19 cause.” See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). Because plaintiff has not provided sufficient information  
20 to allow the Marshal to locate and serve Dr. Pendleton, plaintiff must remedy the situation or  
21 face dismissal. See Walker v. Sumner, 14 F.3d 1415, 1421-22 (9th Cir. 1994) (holding  
22 prisoner failed to show good cause why prison official should not be dismissed under Rule  
23 4(m) where prisoner failed to show he had provided Marshal with sufficient information to  
24 effectuate service). Accordingly, plaintiff must either himself effect service on defendant Dr.  
25 Pendleton, or provide the Court with an accurate current location such that the Marshal is  
26 able to effect such service. Plaintiff’s failure to do so, as ordered below, will result in

---

27  
28       <sup>10</sup>In light of this finding, the Court need not address defendants’ alternative argument  
that the claims have not been exhausted.

1 dismissal of this matter pursuant to Rule 4(m).

2 **CONCLUSION**

3 For the foregoing reasons, the motion for summary judgment of defendants M.  
4 Inocencio, Horacio Campos, M.D. and Martha Campos, M.D. is hereby GRANTED.

5 If plaintiff fails to effectuate service on defendant J. Pendleton, M.D. or provide the  
6 Court with an accurate current location for said defendant, within **thirty (30) days** of the date  
7 this order is filed, plaintiff's claims against said defendant will be dismissed without  
8 prejudice pursuant to Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

9 This order terminates Docket No. 36.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED: September 27, 2006

  
12 MAXINE M. CHESNEY  
13 United States District Judge